



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,972	10/30/2003	Carsten Sorensen	M61.12-0541	8498
27366 7590 12/07/2009 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
STRODER, CARRIE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3689				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/696,972

Applicant(s)

SORENSEN, CARSTEN

Examiner

CARRIE A. STRODER

Art Unit

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the applicant's communication filed on 16 October 2009, wherein:

Claims 1-35 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner has reviewed applicant's disclosure and submits that these added limitations find no support in the specification as currently written, and is, therefore, directed to new matter.

a. Claim 1: "wherein the identification information for each entry in the index is provided to the index by the RFQ generator that generated the RFQ with which the entry is

associated" is not described in the specification as written. Examiner reviewed the specification (no specific portions were cited) and did not find the quoted element.

b. Claim 1: "by providing information requested in an RFQ template associated with the retrieved RFQ" is not described in the specification as written. Examiner reviewed the specification (no specific portions were cited) and found that the specification does not suggest the "associating" aspect of the quoted element.

c. Claim 11: "using the RFQ generator" is not described in the specification as written. Examiner reviewed the specification (no specific portions were cited) and did not find the quoted element.

d. Claim 11: "preparing the processor to receive the response" is not described in the specification as written. Examiner reviewed the specification (no specific portions were cited) and did not find the quoted element.

e. Claim 19: "the indexing information being provided by an RFQ generator at the requester that generated the RFQ" is not described in the specification as written. Examiner reviewed the specification (no specific portions were cited) and did not find the quoted element.

f. Claim 24: "the index including entries each of which the entry is provided by an RFQ generator that generated the RFQ with which the entry is associated" is not described in the specification as written. Examiner reviewed the specification (no specific portions were cited) and did not find the quoted element.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 recites "preparing the processor to receive the response." However, it is unclear what this involves.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In order for a method to be considered a "process" under §101, a claimed process must either: (1) tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transforms a particular article to a different state or thing. This is called the "machine or-transformation test". In re Bilski, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under §101 and is non-statutory subject matter.

There are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent-eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such a data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test.

With respect to claims 1-23, the claim language does not include the required tie to a particular machine or apparatus or transformation and thus is directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Although the preamble of the independent claims states

that they are "computer implemented," there is no tie to a machine in the claims. For example, claim 1 refers to "processor instructions," but this is not a clear tie to a machine. In fact, the inclusion of processor executed instructions in the claims is confusing. It makes it unclear exactly which statutory class applicant is claiming (a computer readable medium with computer executable instructions stored thereon is interpreted as an article of manufacture), an article of manufacture, or a method. Examiner recommends that applicant remove all references to instructions in the claims and include a specific tie to a machine, such as a processor or a computer. Although claim 11 includes a processor in the body of the claim, the step is insignificant post-solution activity. Examiner further points out that the "RFQ generator" appears to be software.

2. **Claims 24-35 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to software, per se. The claims are functional descriptive material as they are directed to a system defined merely by software or terms synonymous with software, particularly "engine." Applicant has attempted to overcome this rejection by including instructions stored on a computer storage medium, *but this does not supply the required structure.*

Structure which might overcome this rejection is, for example, a processor or a computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-6, 8-12, 15, 19-20, 23-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hajmiragha (US 6289460), in view of Beran et al. (US 20020055888).**

Referring to claim 1:

Hajmiragha teaches
accessing an index by executing processor instructions,
wherein the index is stored in a first data store on a remotely
located computer storage media having one entry for each of a
plurality of RFQs, each entry including identification
information related to one of the RFQs with which it is
associated, each of the RFQs being generated by one of a
plurality of requests and stored at one of a plurality of data
stores remotely located from the first data store (col. 2, line

50 thru col. 3, line 28 & col. 10, lines 16-19; where "the document manager allows search against the content of a document as well as the document attributes" implies each entry includes identification information related to one of the RFQ's and where "document" is interpreted to include RFQ's);

identifying an RFQ for reply, by selecting an entry in the index, including identifying, from information in the selected index entry, a second data store in which the identified RFQ is stored from one of the plurality remotely located data stores (col. 10, lines 16-19 & col. 7, lines 11-21; where it is implied that the location of the document is identified); and

retrieving the identified RFQ from the second data store (col. 5, lines 1-14; "users allow other interested parties access to read-only archived documents while maintaining security and control").

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches wherein the identification information for each entry in the index is provided to the index by the RFQ generator that generated the RFQ with which the entry is associated (paragraphs 22 and 26; "The agency requisitioner module 208 enables the user to produce and transmit a request for the purchase of particular goods and services." and "The commerce system 100 allows an agency to retain its own document numbering system by performing

translations to and from the system's internal indexing scheme. For example, where an agency's designation for the first RFQ of the year 1999 may be "RFQ990001," the system will in real-time translate such entered document designations into its own index, such as "Q1999000001."); and

generating a reply to the retrieved RFQ by providing information requested in an RFQ template associated with the retrieved RFQ (paragraph 60; "the vendor completes a response data page 700. Preferably, this page prompts the vendor to enter a price for the goods or services requested and any comment that the vendor desires to include regarding any desired transaction terms." where the "response data page" is interpreted as an RFQ template and "The vendor response data is then stored in an RFX Response Detail record, which collects all of the vendor responses 704. This new record is linked with the original RFX record by the original RFX record reference number.").

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha as taught by Beran because this would provide a manner in which to direct what the replies to the RFQ's should include.

Referring to claims 2 and 25:

Hajmiragha teaches

filtering entries in the index of RFQ's based on supplier filter criteria to create a subset of entries that meet the supplier filter criteria (col. 10, lines 16-22); and

selecting the index entry from the subset of entries (col. 10, lines 16-22; where it is implied that an entry is selected from the subset).

Referring to claims 3 and 26:

Hajmiragha teaches

applying detailed supplier filter criteria to the retrieved RFQ based on a content of the retrieved RFQ (col. 10, lines 16-22).

Referring to claim 4 and 27:

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches

generating a reply to the retrieved RFQ only if it meets the detailed supplier filter criteria (paragraphs 57 and 60; "The system then filters the set of vendors according to their profiles and the basic NIGP code specified in the RFXs to determine the subset of vendors that will receive a notification regarding a particular RFX 610." and "First, with the receipt of the e-mail notification, the vendor completes a response data page 700. Preferably, this page prompts the vendor to enter a price for the goods or services requested and any comment that the vendor desires to include regarding any desired transaction

terms. Once the response page is completed, the vendor can submit the data as its bid.").

Referring to claim 5:

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Han teaches transmitting the reply to the requester that generated the retrieved RFQ (paragraph 61; "The buyer has the option of viewing the vendor responses, including vendor line item instructions and comments, scanning the database for the award history corresponding to a particular vendor that responded, and sending a personalized e-mail to a vendor contact.").

Referring to claims 6 and 28:

Hajmiragha teaches generating the reply comprises accessing the content of the retrieved RFQ (col. 6, lines 37-59; where "review" implies that the content of the RFQ is accessed); and generating the reply based on the content of the RFQ (col. 6, lines 37-59; where "approval" and "collaboration" imply that the reply is based upon the contents of the document).

Referring to claim 8:

Hajmiragha teaches accessing the index over a global computer network (col. 2, lines 51-55; where "internet" is interpreted as a global computer network).

Referring to claim 9:

Hajmiragha teaches
retrieving the identified RFQ from the data store at the requester over a global computer network (col. 5, lines 1-14).

Referring to claim 10:

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Han teaches
prior to accessing the index, providing supplier registration information to a registration component (paragraph 16; "The software system implementation includes an agency registration module 200, a vendor registration module 202, a login module 204, an agency system administrator module 206, an agency requisitioner module 208, an agency buyer module 210, an agency approver module 212, a vendor access module 214 and a batch module 216."); and

downloading a reply engine, the reply engine accessing the index (paragraph 60; where it is inherent in using the "response data page" that the information be downloaded).

Referring to claim 11:

Hajmiragha teaches
saving the RFQ template by employing the process or execute instructions at a predetermined location in a data store local to a computer system at the requester, such that the RFQ template is exposed for downloading to a supplier for generation

of a reply (col. 7, lines 10-21; where "document" is interpreted as including an RFQ template); and

sending indexing information for computer implemented indexing of the RFQ template to an index remote from the computer system of the requester when the RFQ template is saved without prompting from the remote index (col. 7, lines 10-21).

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches

sending indexing information using the RFQ generator (paragraphs 22 and 26; "The agency requisitioner module 208 enables the user to produce and transmit a request for the purchase of particular goods and services." and "The commerce system 100 allows an agency to retain its own document numbering system by performing translations to and from the system's internal indexing scheme. For example, where an agency's designation for the first RFQ of the year 1999 may be "RFQ990001," the system will in real-time translate such entered document designations into its own index, such as "Q1999000001.")

entering the job information into a predetermined RFQ template (paragraph 27; "As shown in FIG. 4, a requisitioner first enters request document data on an HTML header page that has been provided to the user/requisitioner 400. The software enabling the entry of request document data is part of the

agency requisitioner module 208. The request document header data for entry preferably includes a reference number for the request document and a confirming number" and where the "HTML header page" is interpreted as a template).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha as taught by Beran because this would provide a manner in which to direct what the RFQ's should include.

Referring to claim 12:

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches prior to entering the job information, providing supplier registration information to a registration component (paragraph 16; "The software system implementation includes an agency registration module 200, a vendor registration module 202, a login module 204, an agency system administrator module 206, an agency requisitioner module 208, an agency buyer module 210, an agency approver module 212, a vendor access module 214 and a batch module 216.").

downloading an RFQ generation engine, the RFQ generation engine sending the indexing information (paragraphs 22-26; where it is inherent in using the "HTML header page" that the information be downloaded).

Referring to claims 15 and 32:

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Han teaches receiving a reply to the RFQ template from a supplier (paragraph 60; "...the vendor can submit the data as its bid").

Referring to claim 19:

Hajmiragha teaches receiving indexing information for each RFQ from the requester without prompting of the requester, the indexing information being indicative of the RFQ stored at requester data store local to the computer system at the requester (col. 7, lines 10-21; where "document" is interpreted as including an RFQ); and

entering an entry by executing instructions with the processor in a data store on a computer storage media remote from the requester computer system for each RFQ in an index based on the index information, the entry being indicative of a category of a corresponding RFQ on the requester data store, the index being exposed to access by suppliers (col. 7, lines 10-21 and col. 6, lines 9-19; where "content indexing" is interpreted to include an entry indicative of a category of a corresponding RFQ).

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches

the indexing information being provided by an RFQ generator at the requester that generated the RFQ paragraphs 22 and 26; "The agency requisitioner module 208 enables the user to produce and transmit a request for the purchase of particular goods and services." and "The commerce system 100 allows an agency to retain its own document numbering system by performing translations to and from the system's internal indexing scheme. For example, where an agency's designation for the first RFQ of the year 1999 may be "RFQ990001," the system will in real-time translate such entered document designations into its own index, such as "Q1999000001.").

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha as taught by Beran because this would provide a manner in which to direct what the replies to the RFQ's should include.

Referring to claim 20:

Hajmiragha teaches
for each entry in the index, including filter criteria accessible by the suppliers to identify RFQs for reply (col. 10, lines 16-22).

Further, "to identify RFQs for reply" is a statement of intended use. Statements of intended use do not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. See MPEP 2106.

Referring to claim 23:

Hajmiragha teaches
the indexing information be received from a remote requester over a network (col. 7, lines 11-21).

Referring to claim 24:

Hajmiragha teaches
an RFQ reply engine including instructions stored on a computer storage medium and executed by a processor for accessing, without prompting, an index of RFQs stored on a data store, the index including entries provided by a computer system at a requester that is remote from the data store (col. 2, line 50 thru col. 3, line 28 & col. 10, lines 16-19; where "the document manager allows search against the content of a document as well as the document attributes" implies each entry includes identification information related to one of the RFQ's and where "document" is interpreted to include RFQ's), identify an RFQ for reply (col. 10, lines 16-19 & col. 7, lines 11-21; where it is implied that the location of the document is identified), retrieve the identified RFQ from the computer system at the requester (col. 5, lines 1-14; "users allow other interested

parties access to read-only archived documents while maintaining security and control"), and generate a reply to the retrieved RFQ (col. 6, lines 37-59; where "approval" and "collaboration" are interpreted as a reply).

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches the index including entries, each of which is provided by an RFQ generator that generated the RFQ with which the entry is associated (paragraphs 22 and 26; "The agency requisitioner module 208 enables the user to produce and transmit a request for the purchase of particular goods and services." and "The commerce system 100 allows an agency to retain its own document numbering system by performing translations to and from the system's internal indexing scheme. For example, where an agency's designation for the first RFQ of the year 1999 may be "RFQ990001," the system will in real-time translate such entered document designations into its own index, such as "Q1999000001.").

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha as taught by Beran because this would provide a manner in which to direct what the replies to the RFQ's should include.

Referring to claim 29:

Hajmiragha teaches

saves the RFQ template at a predetermined location in a data store on a computer storage medium local to a computer system at the requester, such that the RFQ template is exposed for downloading to a supplier for generation of a reply (col. 7, lines 10-21; where "document" is interpreted as including an RFQ template),

Hajmiragha does not teach; however, Beran teaches

an RFQ generation engine including stored instructions executed by a processor that receives the job information into a predetermined RFQ template (paragraphs 22-25; "...a requisitioner first enters request document data on an HTML header page..."), and

collects and sends indexing information for computer implemented indexing of the RFQ template at an index on a remote computer system without prompting from the remote computer system (paragraphs 22 and 26; "The agency requisitioner module 208 enables the user to produce and transmit a request for the purchase of particular goods and services." and "The commerce system 100 allows an agency to retain its own document numbering system by performing translations to and from the system's internal indexing scheme. For example, where an agency's designation for the first RFQ of the year 1999 may be

"RFQ990001," the system will in real-time translate such entered document designations into its own index, such as "Q1999000001.").

3. Claims 13-14, 21-22, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hajmiragha (US 6289460) in view of Han et al. (US 20020052807).

Referring to claims 13 and 30:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however, Han teaches entering requester filter criteria indicative of suppliers authorized to reply to the RFQ template (paragraph 94; "participant defines which suppliers are to receive the new RFQ packet").

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha and Beran as taught by Han because this would provide a manner in which to filter suppliers so that replies are generated only by suppliers who meet the standards of the buyer, thereby reducing wasted time and/or effort of the buyers and suppliers.

Referring to claims 14 and 31:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however, Han teaches sending requester filter criteria indicative of suppliers authorized to reply to the RFQ template (paragraph 94;

"participant defines which suppliers are to receive the new RFQ packet").

Referring to claim 21:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however, Han teaches wherein receiving the indexing information includes receiving an identifier of a specific supplier (paragraphs 94 and 104-106).

Referring to claim 22:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however, Han teaches the specific supplier be notified when the RFQ identifying the supplier is indexed (paragraph 94).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha and Beran as taught by Han because this would provide a way to generate a response from a supplier once the RFQ is indexed; otherwise the supplier may be unaware that an RFQ he may wish to respond to has been indexed.

4. **Claims 7, 16-18, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hajmiragha (US 6289460) in view of Beran et al. (US 20020055888), and further in view of Heimermann et al. (US 7110976).**

Referring to claim 7:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however Heimermann teaches

automatically generating the reply based on the content of the RFQ (paragraphs 181-182).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha and Beran as taught by Heimermann because this provides a more cost effective supplier sourcing system.

Referring to claims 16 and 33:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however Heimermann teaches

entering award criteria indicative of criteria considered in awarding a job corresponding to the RFQ to a supplier (paragraph 183).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Hajmiragha and Beran as taught by Heimermann because this provides a more cost effective supplier sourcing system.

Referring to claims 17 and 34:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however Heimermann teaches

evaluating the received reply based on the award criteria (paragraph 183); and

suggesting a winning supplier based on the evaluation of the award criteria (paragraph 183).

Referring to claims 18 and 35:

Hajmiragha and Beran do not teach; however Heimermann teaches

weighting the award criteria according to a predetermined weight (paragraph 183; the system primarily makes awards based on price, but also "factors in" other considerations, which necessarily requires assigning a predetermined weight to the considerations).

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 05 May 2009 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

a. Claim 1: "wherein the identification information for each entry in the index is provided to the index by the RFQ generator that generated the RFQ with which the entry is associated"

- b. Claim 1: "by providing information requested in an RFQ template associated with the retrieved RFQ"
- c. Claim 11: "using the RFQ generator"
- d. Claim 11: "preparing the processor to receive the response"
- e. Claim 19: "the indexing information being provided by an RFQ generator at the requester that generated the RFQ"
- f. Claim 24: "the index including entries each of which the entry is provided by an RFQ generator that generated the RFQ with which the entry is associated"

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARRIE A. STRODER whose telephone number is (571)270-7119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jan Mooneyham can be reached on (571)272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CARRIE A. STRODER/
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Janice A. Mooneyham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689